

# WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

---

October 18, 2004

OK

TO: Internal File

THRU: Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor *WH*

FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist *DS*

RE: 2004 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, Energy West Mining Company, Trail Mountain Mine, C/015/0009-WQ04-2, Task ID # 1971

1. Were data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [X] NO [ ]

*Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:*

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data?

*See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.*

## Resampling Due Date

Renewal submittal due 10/21/04, renewal due 02/21/05. Baseline analyses were performed in 1996, 2001 and will be repeated every 5 years, i.e., next baseline analyses will be in 2006.

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES [X] NO [ ]

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

**4. Were irregularities found in the data?**

YES ☒ NO ☐

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

SW-1: Ca (n = 20), TDS (n = 119), and total anions (n = 71; not a required parameter) were outside the two standard deviation range.

TM-1B: depth reported for this piezometer was outside the two standard deviation range because the depth was measured in feet but entered into database in meters; Dennis Oakley confirmed this and it has been corrected.

TM-3: "no artesian pressure" was reported in April and "dry" for May and June. Water level in this piezometer has been recovering since Trail Mountain Mine operations ceased. A well cap and pressure gauge were installed August 2003 because water was approaching the top of the casing, but the gauge has not reported any pressure since installation and may not be functioning. The Permittee has previously stated that the well would be opened in spring 2004 to see why the gauge isn't reporting a rise in pressure, but apparently this was not done.

**5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?**

1<sup>st</sup> month, YES ☒ NO ☐

2<sup>nd</sup> month, YES ☒ NO ☐

3<sup>rd</sup> month, YES ☒ NO ☐

*Identify sites and months not monitored:*

DMRs were submitted in electronic format (Adobe). There was no discharge from either UPDES point during the second quarter. The mine was sealed in June 2001 and there has been no reported discharge at UPDES UT23728-002 (the mine-water discharge into Cottonwood Creek) since May 2001.

**6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?**

YES ☒ NO ☐

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

There was no discharge from either UPDES point during the second quarter.

**7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?**

YES ☐ NO ☒

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

Page 3

C/015/0009-WQ04-2

Task ID #1971

October 18, 2004

**8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?**

TM-3: it is doubtful this well is "dry". The Permittee has previously stated that the wellhead would be opened in spring 2004 to see why the gauge isn't reporting pressure: it appears this has not been done. The Permittee needs to restore the water-level or water-pressure measuring system in this well.

O:\015009.TMT\WATER QUALITY\JDS1971.DOC